

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 9, 11, 12, 14-17, 22-24, 28, 33-35, 40, 44, and 47-58 were pending in this application. With this Amendment, the applicants request that claims 59-62 be added. With the acceptance of these additional dependent claims, claims , 11, 12, 14-17, 22-24, 28, 33-35, 40, 44, and 47-62 are pending in this application. Claims 59 and 60 have been added to recite that the support consists of the at least one reducible oxide. Support for these claims can be found in the specification at, for example, page 5, lines 5 and 6 ("the support *per se* can comprise particulate bulk reducible oxide"). In addition, claims 61 and 62 have been added to recite that ceria serves as both the support material and as the promoter. Support for these claims can be found in the specification at, for example, page 5, lines 24 and 25 ("the particulate ceria serves as the Pd support and promoter"). The applicants believe that no new issue for further search and/or consideration is presented by these dependent claims.


The disclosure has been objected to because of certain informalities with respect to the legibility at the bottom of some pages. Accordingly, the applicants submit a formal substitute specification. As previously stated, applicants submit that the originally filed disclosure (filed by Express Mail) contained no such illegible print.

The Reasons for Allowance state that the independent claims recite "a catalyst comprising palladium supported on a support material and at least one base metal promoter **associated with** the palladium, wherein said at least one base metal promoter comprises at least one reducible oxide" (emphasis in original). To clarify, the Applicants note that the independent claims encompass embodiments, among others, in which (1) the support could consist of the at least one reducible oxide and (2) ceria could serve as both the support material and as the base metal promoter. This coverage has now been made express with the inclusion of dependent claims 59-62.

Dependent claims were rejected provisionally on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as unpatenable over claims 1-3, 13-21, 25, 30-34, and 36-47 of co-pending Application No. 10/527,634. As this is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection, and the related application has not yet been allowed, the applicants will refrain from addressing this rejection at this time.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher R. Lewis, Reg. No. 36,201
Attorney for Applicants

CRL/lrb

Attachment: Substitute Specification

Dated: September 29, 2008

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482-0980
(610) 407-0700

The Director is hereby authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. **18-0350** for any additional fees, or any underpayment or credit for overpayment in connection herewith.

L_H:\NRPORTBL\RP\LISA\352784_1.DOC